



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

21

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,173	06/27/2003	Jan Chipchase	884A.0012.U1(US)	8233
29683	7590	12/16/2005	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP			REGO, DOMINIC E	
4 RESEARCH DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			2684	
DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/608,173	CHIPCHASE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dominic E. Rego	2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowe et al. (US Patent #5,671,362) in view of Taylor (US Patent #5,727,693).

Regarding claim 1, Cowe teaches a repository (*Figure 1, element 10*), for a plurality of objects (*Figure 2, element 30*), comprising: a body for supporting simultaneously a plurality of objects (*Col. 1, line 9-12*); wireless communication means for communicating with at least one of the plurality of objects (*Col 5, line 7-12, Col 5, line 37-44*); and a user interface responsive to the wireless communication means for providing information to a user (*Col 5, line 27-36*), except for a repository comprising a plurality of objects including a mobile phone.

However, in related art, Taylor teaches a repository (*pager holder*) comprising a plurality of objects including a mobile phone (*Col. 1, line 55-64*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching of a repository comprising a plurality

of objects including a mobile phone, as taught by Taylor, in the Cowe's device in order to provide a pager holder which is compactly designed for efficient storage of pagers and other objects (*Taylor, Col 1, 61-64*).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 1. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository (*Figure 1, element 10*), wherein the wireless communication means is arranged to detect proximal objects by communication therewith (*Col 5, line 37-44*).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 2. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, wherein the wireless communication means comprises a LPRF transceiver (*Col 9, line 60-Col 10, line 4*).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 2. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository wherein the wireless communication means comprises an RFID detector (*Sensor*) (*Col 53-56*).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 1. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, wherein the wireless communication means transfers data from an object (*Col 5, line 37-44*).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed

elements in claim 5. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, wherein the wireless communication means comprises a LPRF transceiver (*Col 9, line 60-Col 10, line 4*).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 1. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, wherein the wireless communication means comprises a LPRF transceiver for detecting proximal objects by communication therewith and for transferring data from a proximal object (*Col 9, line 60-Col 10, line 4*).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 7. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, further comprising a memory; and a processor for controlling a display of the user interface to display the transferred data (*Col 12, line 28-41*).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 1. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository in the form of a shelf (*Col 5, line 54-60*).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 1. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository having a substantially planer support surface (See *Figure 3*).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 1. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, wherein the wireless communication means identifies (*sense*) an object that has been removed from the repository (*Col 2, line 40-47, Col 10, line 41-45, Col 7, line 61-67*).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 12. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, further comprising a processor responsive to the communication means for activating an alert in the user interface (*Col 2, line 30-39, Col 2, line 55-67, Col 7, line 3-10*).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 13. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, wherein the processor is arranged to activate the alert when a first object has been removed from the repository but a second object has not been removed (*Col 2, line 30-39, Col 2, line 55-67, Col 7, line 3-10*).

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 13. In addition, Cowe teaches a repository, wherein the processor is arranged to activate the alert in dependence upon data transferred via the communication means to the repository and the removal of a first object from the repository (*Col 9, line 60-Col 10, line 2, Col 2, line 30-39, Col 2, line 55-67, Col 7, line 3-*

10).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowe et al. (*US Patent #5,671,362*) in view of Taylor (*US Patent #5,727,693*) and further in view of Nagaoka et al. (*US Patent Application Publication #20020184112*).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 1, except for a repository comprising a display for displaying information received from the mobile phone.

However, in related art, Nagaoka teaches a repository comprising a display for displaying information received from the mobile phone (*Paragraph 0050 and 0051*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching of a repository comprising a display for displaying information received from the mobile phone, as taught by Nagaoka, in the combination of Cowe and Taylor device in order to keep in track of all the informations that repository receives.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowe et al. (*US Patent #5,671,362*) in view of Taylor (*US Patent #5,727,693*) and further in view of Fan (*US Patent #6,639,382*).

Regarding claim 16, Cowe teaches a repository (*Figure 1, element 10*), comprising: a body having a support surface for supporting simultaneously a plurality of objects (*Figure 2, element 30*), except for a repository comprising a plurality of objects including a mobile telephone.

However, in related art, Taylor teaches a repository (*pager holder*) comprising a plurality of objects including a mobile telephone (*Col. 1, line 55-64*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching of a repository comprising a plurality of objects including a mobile phone, as taught by Taylor, in the Cowe's device in order to provide a pager holder which is compactly designed for efficient storage of pagers and other objects (*Taylor, Col 1, 61-64*).

The combination of Cowe and Taylor teach all the claimed elements in claim 16, except for a repository comprising charging circuitry, within the body, for recharging a mobile telephone.

However, in related art, Fan teaches charging circuitry, within the body, for recharging a mobile telephone (*Col 1, line 13-22, Col 2, line 26-34*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching of a repository comprising charging circuitry, within the body, for recharging a mobile telephone, as taught by Fan, in the combination of Cowe and Taylor device in order to charge the mobile phone.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
4. Hollingsworth (US Patent Application publication #20040099496) teaches carrying cases with pop-out compartment.
5. Bendall et al. (US Patent Application publication #20040099496) teaches remote video inspection system.
6. Stubbings (US Patent #4,120,181) teaches locking mechanism.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dominic E. Rego whose telephone number is 571-272-8132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am-5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2684



Dominic E. Rego

EDAN ORGAD
PATENT EXAMINER/TELECOMM.

D.O. 12/6/05